

BEFORE THE
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

COMPETITIVE PRODUCT PRICES
EXPRESS MAIL CONTRACT 11 (MC2011-14)
NEGOTIATED SERVICE AGREEMENT

Docket No. CP2011-50

**NOTICE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE OF
FILING SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS FOR
AMENDMENT TO EXPRESS MAIL CONTRACT 11
(May 28, 2013)**

The Postal Service hereby provides notice that it is supplementing its filing of the amendment to Express Mail Contract 11 (filed May 24, 2013), with the supporting financial documentation and certified statement required by 39 C.F.R. § 3015.5. The certified statement is attached to this pleading. Redacted versions of the financial analysis are also included with this filing. Unredacted versions are being filed under seal today. The Postal Service's original application for non-public treatment in this docket is hereby incorporated by reference for the protection of these materials.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr.
Chief Counsel, Pricing and Product Support

Elizabeth A. Reed

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-3179, Fax -6187
elizabeth.a.reed@usps.gov
May 28, 2013

Certification of Prices for Amendment to Express Mail Contract 11

I, Steven R. Phelps, Manager, Regulatory Reporting and Cost Analysis, Finance Department, am familiar with the prices and terms for the amendment to Express Mail Contract 11. The amended prices and terms contained in this Contract were established by the Decision of the Governors of the United States Postal Service on Establishment of Rate and Class Not of General Applicability for Express Mail Contract Group, dated October 26, 2009 (Governors' Decision No. 09-14).

I hereby certify, based on in the financial analysis provided herewith, that the amended prices are in compliance with 39 U.S.C § 3633 (a)(1), (2), and (3). They are expected to cover attributable costs. There should therefore be no subsidization of competitive products by market dominant products. The amended contract should not impair the ability of competitive products on the whole to cover an appropriate share of institutional costs.



Steven R. Phelps